REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claim 11 without disclaimer. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 7-10 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-10 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 6-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,717,558 (Lynn et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,563,319 (Kraz). Claims 3-5 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 3-5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 6-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynn et al. in view of Kraz. Claim 11 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as to the remaining pending claims.

Kraz discloses ESD and transient signal monitoring wherein an ESD monitoring device may be used to continuously monitor ESD events and generate an indication of the magnitude of the ESD events. A method of protecting an electronic device from ESD events is also described.

Lynn et al. discloses an electrostatic discharge (ESD) protection for an electrical device being provided through an arrangement which detects an ESD event occurring in the device and reconfigures a processor in the device after the ESD event so that the event is essentially transparent to a user of the device. A detector circuit incorporated into the device detects the occurrence of the ESD event and, in response thereto, generates a trigger signal which is coupled to the processor. Upon receipt of this trigger signal, the processor retrieves status information that is stored in a non-volatile memory and was previously contained in a program being executed just prior to the ESD event, reconfigures itself using the status information, and resumes operation with this status information.

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 10 Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, comparing screen data stored in a memory unit and screen data stored in an internal memory of a display unit, resetting the display unit if the compared screen data are different, or continuously maintaining an operation state of the display unit if the compared screen data are identical. The cited portions of Lynn et al. do not disclose

or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Lynn et al. merely discloses reconfiguring a device, with status information retrieved just prior to the ESD event, after occurrence of the ESD event. This is not resetting a display unit if screen data stored in the memory unit and screen data displayed on the display unit are different, as recited in the claims of the present application. There is no determination in Lynn et al. whether displayed screen data is different from stored screen data after an ESD event, and then performing an appropriate action. Lynn et al. merely performs a reconfiguration with stored status information after an ESD event. Further, Lynn et al. does not disclose or suggest continuously maintaining an operation state of the display unit if the screen data stored in the memory unit and the screen data displayed on the display unit are identical.

The Examiner admits that Lynn does not disclose or suggest a display, but asserts that Kraz discloses these limitations in the abstract, figures 1 and 2, col. 3, line 42 to col. 4, line 50 and col. 6, lines 15-32. However, these portions merely disclose details regarding the ESD event monitoring device and its circuitry shown in figures 1 and 2 that includes a bar graph indicator 22 to display the magnitude of the ESD event. This is not a display unit containing screen data where the screen data is stored in a memory unit and upon occurrence of static electricity, the display unit is reset if the screen data stored in the memory unit and the screen data displayed on the display are different, or maintaining an operation state of the display unit if the screen data stored in the memory unit and the screen data displayed on the display unit are identical. Kraz

does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. The Examiner appears to imply that Lynn et al. discloses if the ESD event is not present, the operation state is continuously maintained, at col. 4, lines 49-54. However, these portions merely disclose that during normal operation when the ESD event is not present, the data latch couples data received from the control unit directly to the transmitter and the receiver as this data is received from the control unit. This is not continuously maintaining an operation state of the display unit if the compared screen data are identical, after recognizing an occurrence of static electricity.

Regarding claims 2, 6, 8 and 9, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 7 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-10 of the present application. Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1, 2 and 6-11 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg
Date: September 14, 2006
\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-765\97932.doc
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610